

TSMC-00-338



COPY OF PAPERS
ORIGINALLY FILED

February 28, 2002

CP2823

4/Election
2/7/02
A. Waller

To: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Attn: Art Unit 2823 - N. Berezny

From: George O. Saile, Reg. No. 19,572

20 McIntosh Drive

Poughkeepsie, N. Y., 12603

RECEIVED
MAR 27 2002
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

RECEIVED

APR 09 2002

Technology Center 2100

Subject: | Serial No.: 09/785,114 02/20/01 |

Pin-Shyne Chin et al.

A LOW LEAKAGE ONE TRANSISTOR STATIC
RANDOM ACCESS MEMORY

| _ Art Group: 2823 N. Berezny _ |

RECEIVED
APR 29 2002
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

This is in response to the Restriction or Election Requirement in the Office Action dated 02/12/02. In that Office Action, restriction was required to one of two stated

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231, on March 12, 2002.

Stephen B. Ackerman, Reg.# 37761

Signature/Date

SBC

3/12/02

RECEIVED
APR 28 2002
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Inventions under 35 U.S.C. 121. The Inventions stated are Group I - Claims 1-8 to a process, classified in Class 438, subclass 238+ and Group II - Claims 9-14 to an SRAM device, classified in Class 257, subclass 296+.

Applicant provisionally elects to be examined the Invention described by the Examiner as Group I - Claims 1-8 drawn to a process classified in Class 438, subclass 238+. This election is made with traverse of the requirement under 37 C.F.R.1.143 for the reasons given in the following paragraphs.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the Requirement for Restriction given in the Office Action. The Examiner gives the reason for the distinctness of the two inventions as (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different products or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP 806.05(f)). However, upon reading the product Claims against the process Claims one can readily see that the product Claims are directed to "a structure for a 1T SRAM" and the process Claims are directed to "a method of fabrication of a 1T Static Random Access Memory (SRAM)", it is necessary to obtain claims in both the product and method claim language. The method Claims necessarily use the product and vice versa. The field of search must necessarily cover both

the method class/subclass 438/238+ and products class 257/296+ in addition to other related Classes and subclasses to provide a complete and adequate search. The fields of search for the Group I and Group II inventions are clearly and necessarily co-extensive. The Examiner's suggestion that "the product can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP 806.05(f)). In the instant case, instead of implanting through the mask, thermally diffuse the dopant from the surface of the exposed substrate", is very speculative and really has nothing to do with the Claims as presented in this Patent Application. Further, it is respectfully suggested that these reasons are insufficient to place the additional cost of a second Patent Application upon the Applicants. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw this restriction requirement for these reasons.

Withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement and the Allowance of the present Patent Application is requested.

Sincerely,



Stephen B. Ackerman, Reg.# 37761